DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 396 339 CS 509 220

AUTHOR Michel, Elizabeth C.
TITLE The Stipulations Chart: Incorporating Communication Theory into Message Construction in the Basic Course.
PUB DATE Nov 95
NOTE 20p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Speech Communication Association (81st, San Antonio, TX, November 18-21, 1995).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Guides - Classroom Use - Teaching Guides (For Teacher) (052) -- Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS Audience Awareness; Higher Education; *Instructional Effectiveness; *Introductory Courses; Persuasive Discourse; *Speech Communication; *Theory Practice Relationship
IDENTIFIERS Message Based Performances; *Theoretical Orientation

ABSTRACT

The Stipulations Chart is a simple summary of some 90 tenets of communication theory, arranged in a way that allows students in basic communication courses to access those tenets which are relevant to a communication at hand. The 5-page chart organizes theoretical tenets in 2 columns; according to the communication "situation" and the corresponding theoretical recommendation. The chart covers: (1) audience predispositions toward speaker, topic, and situation; (2) topic complexity and salience; (3) situational stipulations such as room size, audience size, and room temperature; and (4) a variety of affective and objective speaker goals. An instructor has found that the Stipulations Chart is most effective when used after the students have become comfortable with basic message construction (usually after the second speech). Students refer to the chart after completing an outline for a speech but before designing the detailed message. They then check off (as many times as necessary) any and all items which describe their current communication situation. They also look to the right of those items checked, incorporating the theoretical suggestions as they construct the message. The chart and the process have been tested with students, beginning teachers, and college instructors. (Contains 114 references. The Stipulations Chart is attached.) (RS)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 396 339

The Stipulations Chart: Incorporating Communication Theory into Message Construction in the Basic Course

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN OTHER THAN PAPER COPY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

E Michel

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Elizabeth C. Michel, Head
Communication Program

Mars Hill College
Mars Hill, North Carolina 28754
704-689-1136 (o)
704-689-1474 (FAX)

CS 509 220

Paper presented at
1995 Speech Communication Association Convention
San Antonio, Texas

TOP FOUR PAPERS PANEL
THE BASIC COURSE COMMISSION

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The Stipulations Chart: Incorporating Communication Theory into Message Construction in the Basic Course

At the 1994 SCA convention, participants in a short course were asked to share a way in which they had successfully (or unsuccessfully) made communication theory come alive in undergraduate classes. The author shared a system she had developed and tested over the past five years by which theoretical tenets could be readily accessed during communication design in the Basic Course. The response was enthusiastic and immediate. From that response and in reaction to this year's SCA theme of integrating theory and practice, it is hoped that this paper will describe the design and use of the Stipulations Chart.

The instrument. The Stipulations Chart is a simple summary of some 90 tenets of communication theory, arranged in a way that allows students to access those tenets which are relevant to a communication at hand. Emanating from class work during an introductory unit on communication theory in a 1989 Public Speaking course at a maajor southeastern research university, the five-page chart organizes theoretical tenets in two columns; according to the communication "situation" and the corresponding theoretical recommendation. For example:

√	WHEN THIS IS THE CASE:	DO THIS:
	You want this audience to experience pleasure, comfort, enjoyment and energy...	**...place them in a pleasant environment.** *(Maslow & Mintz, 1956; Biggers & Pryor, 1982-room beauty)*
	You want this audience to experience higher levels of elation, concentration and vigor...	**...place them in a cool room.** *(Griffit, 1970 - temperature)*
	You want to gain more attention for what you are trying to get across...	**...back up your points with a number of credible sources (3) and site them.** *(Ostermeier, 1967;Swenson, et al., 1984 - source credibility / McCroskey, 1967,1969, 1970; Ostermeier, 1967-citation of evidence source)*
	You want to make a good first impression...	**...pay attention to how you look.** *(Snyder & Rothbart, 1971; Widgery & Ruch, 1981; Chaiken, 1979- physical attractiveness)*

The function of the Stipulations Chart. The chart covers four fundamental factors in any interpersonal, oral communication: (a) audience predispositions toward speaker, topic and situation; (b) topic complexity and salience; (c) situational stipulations such as room size, audience size, room temperature, etc.; and (d) a variety of affective and objective speaker goals.

Intended as a first glance at communication theory, the Stipulations Chart seems to succeed in making theoretical tenets immediately dynamic and relevant to students. Interaction with the left-hand column allows students to assess their immediate subjective and affective needs as speakers. In completing the chart, they automatically analyze the multiple dynamics of the discrete communication situation in which they are involved and then, acknowledging the significance of the recommendations of communication theory, employ relevant tenets to achieve those goals.

Implementation. The author has found that the Stipulations Chart is most effective after students have become comfortable with basic message construction (usually after the second speech). While any number of effective models can be used to teach message construction, the basic method described in Lucas' *The Art of Public Speaking* (Random House, 1993) will serve to describe the implementation.

In short, in order for students to appreciate the practicality of communication theory, they need to have practiced making choices as they've put a message together. They need to be know how to define their topic and focus its parameters. In Lucas' terminology, they need to know how to do a General Purpose Outline - which defines the basic central idea and main points of the message - and a Structural Outline - that completes the communication with the various parts of the introduction, conclusion and supporting statements. Students should be comfortable with making these choices and implementing them in speeches before the communication theory chart is introduced.

Once students have practiced the basics of message construction,the implementation of the chart is quite simple. Introduction and employment of communication theory is applied to the design of a specific speech. The process can best be explained in the sequence in which it occurs in the classroom.

1. When students have identified and focused the topic of their speech, as per the General Purpose Outline - but <u>before</u> designing their detailed message - they refer to the <u>Stipulations Chart</u>. For example, a student's basic topic might look something like this:

<u>GENERAL PURPOSE OUTLINE:</u>

SPEECH TOPIC: RECYCLING
GENERAL PURPOSE: to persuade
SPECIFIC PURPOSE: to persuade my listeners to recycle soda cans
CENTRAL IDEA: It is critical that you understand the enormous environmental impact of the problem of unrecycled cans and how you can become part of the solution.

The speech will take the following "shape," but the student has yet to determine how s/he will complete the logic of the message. Put into a visual format, the student's current orientation toward the message structure looks something like this:

<u>BASIC FORMAT FOR A PERSUASIVE STRUCTURAL OUTLINE</u>
<u>(using Monroe's Motivated Sequence)</u>

ATTENTION(purposeful opening)
_____

General Focusing Information
_____

(Central Idea)
<u>It is critical that you understand the enormous environmental impact of the problem of unrecycled aluminum and exactly how you can become part of the solution</u>.

NEED(Proof that the problem exists)
Proof #1 _____
Proof #2 _____
Proof #3 _____

SATISFACTION(how should this be solved?)
_____

VISUALIZATION (What would this situation be like if my solution was in place?)
_____

ACTION (What specific action do I want these people to take to become part of the solution?)
_____

Purposeful Closing
_____

At this stage, the student is naturally wondering, "How will these parts of the communication be completed to the best effect? How can I be certain I've made the best choices I can so that I'll be listened to and heeded?" The assurance is in the tenets of communication theory!

2. Students are introduced to the Stipulations Chart as the instructor efficiently reviews each tenet, explaining them with an example where necessary.

3. Students next take out their General Purpose Outlines for the upcoming speech. To communicate to the best effect, it will be important to know (a) their audience's predispositions toward them, their topic and the situation in general; (b) their topic's complexity and salience; (c) various situational stipulations such as room size, audience size, room temperature, etc.; and (d) their own personal affective and objective speaker goals.

Far from being the complicated process they anticipate, students can ascertain these qualities and discover the recommendations of reliable communication tenets in about five minutes.

4. Students are instructed to read the statements in the left-hand column of the Stipulations Chart and place a check mark next to any and all items which describe their current communication situation. (NOTE: Place a check next to relevant items EACH TIME they appear. - i.e. "This topic is relevant to this audience" appears several times, and must be checked each time.)

5. Students then look to the right of those items they have checked, incorporating the theoretical suggestions as they construct their message. For example, the chart will suggest that a student giving a counterattitudinal, persuasive message to a small group of peers in a large lecture hall, who wants to be accepted and effective:

a. use rhetorical questions and moderate distractions,
b. increase immediacy, pay attention to his/her appearance but dress like the audience,
c. mention potential opposing arguments and refute them,
d. validate the worth of those who hold opposing arguments,
e. support his/her views with three supporting statements from three disparate, credible sources, etc.

Outcome. The stipulations Chart is meant as an introduction to communication theory. Students find the existence of such stipulations intriguing and encouraging. When they see the impact of the applied theory on their own speeches and those of their peers, they experience the vital relationship between theory and effective practice.

Thus introduced, the theoretical tenets are accessed in a period of four to five minutes, allowing students time to concentrate on message construction and rehearsal. Discussion of conflict between theoretical recommendations or misunderstandings during in-class composition promotes vital discussion based on direct application of substantiated theoretical tenets to real student needs.

This tool and the process by which it is incorporated into the speech design process (Michel, 1993) have been tested with (a) Basic Course students as they design speeches (Michel, 1989), (b) beginning teachers (Michel, 1992) and (c) college instructors (Michel, 1994) as they design lesson plans. It has been used for five consecutive years in the Basic Courses at two southeastern undergraduate institutions. Its extensive research basis is provided in the enclosed reference list. For the benefit of the reader, the primary and/or initial research for each tenet is provided by the italicized notations within each cell of the Stipulations Chart itself.

THE STIPULATIONS CHART©1992

-ACCESSING COMMUNICATION THEORY FOR DISCRETE COMMUNICATIONS-

ELIZABETH C. MICHEL, HEAD
COMMUNICATION PROGRAM, MARS HILL COLLEGE

√	WHEN THIS IS THE CASE:	DO THIS:
	You want this audience to experience pleasure, comfort, enjoyment and energy...	**...place them in a pleasant environment.** *(Maslow & Mintz, 1956; Biggers & Pryor, 1982-room beauty)*
	You want this audience to experience higher levels of elation, concentration and vigor...	**...place them in a cool room.** *(Griffit, 1970 - temperature)*
	You want to gain more attention for what you are trying to get across...	**...back up your points with a number of credible sources (3) and site them.** *(Ostermeier, 1967;Swenson, et al., 1984 - source credibility / McCroskey, 1967,1969, 1970; Ostermeier, 1967-citation of evidence source)*
	You want to make a good first impression...	**...pay attention to how you look.** *(Snyder & Rothbart, 1971; Widgery & Ruch, 1981; Chaiken, 1979- physical attractiveness)*
	You want this audience to think positively about what you are trying to get across...	**...use positive reasons and arguments.**
	You want this audience to think a lot about what you are saying...	**...enhance your personal attractiveness.** *(physical attractiveness)*
	You want them to think of you as having good social and communication skills...	**...enhance your personal attractiveness.** *(physical attractiveness)*
	You want them to analyze part or all of what you are saying...	**...use visual aids.** *(Chaiken & Eagly, 1976-channel effects)*
	You want them to think a lot about a certain part or all of what you are saying...	**...use visual aids.** *(channel effects)*
	You want to keep their attention throughout your communication...	**...use visual aids only when making the point each illustrates; when you're done with that point, cover the relevant visual aid.** *(channel effects)*
	You want to come across as competent and trustworthy...	**...increase eye contact; move away from barriers; directly face the audience; move closer to them.** *(Mehrabian, 1971; Goreham, 1988-proxemics/immediacy)*

	You want to be liked...	**...increase eye contact; move away from barriers; directly face the audience; move closer to them.** *(immediacy)*
	You want to be thought of as having something in common with this audience...	**...increase eye contact; move away from barriers; directly face the audience; move closer to them.** *(immediacy)*
	You want to communicate something simple...	**...speak at a faster rate.** *(Maclachlan & Siegel, 1980; Wolvin & Coakley, 1988-speaking rate)*
	Your audience is large...	**...balance the quality/complexity of your content with a strong delivery.** *(Mehrabian, 1971; Goreham, 1988-proxemics)*
	Your audience is small...	**...figure out how much they like to think and then give them the highest quality of content they can take.** *(proxemics)*
	Your topic is of low relevance to this audience...	**...use music.** *(Gorn, 1982-environmental effect:music)*
	This message is relevant to this audience...	**...increase the complexity of your message; keep the content at a high level.** *(Petty & Cacioppo, 1979b, 1981b, 1984; Petty, Cacioppo & Schumann, 1983-receiver involvement)*
	This topic is of low relevance to this audience...	**...try to make them like you.** *(Applbaum & Anatol, 1972; Pearce & Brommel, 1972; Wachtler & Counselman, 1981-liking for communicator/Johnson & Scileppi, 1969; Petty, Cacioppo & Goldman, 1981-receiver involvement with issue)*
	This topic is relevant to or liked by this audience...	**...avoid distractions.** *(Petty, Wells & Brock, 1976; Bledsoe, 1984-distraction theory)*
	You topic is irrelevant to and/or disliked by this audience...	**...use mild to moderate distractions.** *(distraction theory)*
	This topic is relevant to your audience...	**...you can say more about the subject; cover more ground.** *(Wood, Kallgren & Priesler, 1985; Petty & Cacioppo, 1981-message length)*
	This topic is relevant to your audience...	**...focus on the quality of what you say, not on its length.** *(message length)*
	Your audience is unfamiliar with this topic...	**...use a longer message; spend more time explaining things.** *(message length / Petty & Cacioppo, 1981-prior knowledge)*
	Your audience is familiar with this topic...	**...be sure your points are credible and complex enough; don't worry about taking a long time to explain things.** *(message length -prior knowledge)*

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

	Your communication is complex...	**...write it out for them, either with visual aids or a handout.** *(Chaiken & Eagly, 1976-channel effects)*
	Your point is simple...	**...present it orally, in-person.** *(Andreoli & Worchel, 1978 Chaiken & Eagly, 1983-medium)*
	This topic is of low relevance to this audience...	**...use rhetorical questions.** *(Petty, Cacioppo & Hessacker, 1981-rhetorical theory)*
	This topic is relevant to this audience...	**...do NOT use rhetorical questions.** *(rhetorical theory)*
	This topic does not relate directly to this audience...	**...mention how it relates to you; be sure they know why you are qualified to talk about this.** *(Harmon & Coney, 1982; McGinnies, 1973-source credibility in counter-attitudinal messages)*
	You want to communicate something complex...	**...speak at a slower rate.** *(Andersen & Pryor, 1991-speech rate & comprehension)*
	You want to be thought of as competent and dynamic...	**...eliminate non-fluencies.** *(McCroskey & Mehrley, 1969; Miller & Hewgill, 1964-nonfluencies & delivery)*
	You are afraid of coming across as biased...	**...eliminate any references to yourself.** *(Walster, et al., 1966; Eagley, et al., 1981-position advocated)*
	You are afraid of coming across as biased...	**...argue against your own self-interest.** *(position advocated)*
	Your audience is against you or opposed to receiving what you have to say...	**...use music.** *(Gorn, 1982-environmental effects:music)*
	You want compliance from your audience...	**...serve food during your message.** *(Dabbs & Jones, 1965-environmental effects: food)*
	Your audience is involved in this topic...	**...mention something that proves you know what you're talking about.** *(speaker credibility)*
	Your audience has preconceived ideas about this topic...	**...address their preconceptions and then introduce the desired perspective.** *(McGuire , 1961b; McGuire & Papageorgis, 1961-inoculation theory)*
	Your audience is not interested in what you are going to say...	**...get them involved; make it relevant to them.** *(Andersen & Pryor, 1991-personal relevance)*
	Your audience needs to think about this in order to get it...	**...emphasize the personal relevance to them.** *(personal relevance)*

	Your audience is strongly opposed to listening to what you have to say...	**...do not tell them what it's about ahead of time.** *(Petty & Cacioppo, 1977, 1979a-forewarning theory)*
	Your audience doesn't feel strongly about what you have to say...	**...you can tell them about it ahead of time.** *(forewarning theory)*
	Your audience is enthusiastic about what you have to say...	**...you can tell them about it ahead of time.** *(forewarning theory)*
	This audience is bright...	**...be sure you are discussing this in a new way; make sure you pack your communication with as many high level facts as indicated on the rest of this chart.** *(Petty & Cacioppo, 1986, 1988; Petty, et al., 1984-need for cognition)*
	This audience is less than bright...	**...deemphasize the complexity of your message content; emphasize peripheral cues.** *(need for cognition)*
	Your message is unfamiliar to this audience...	**...repeat your points three times.** *(Leventhal & Niles, 1965; Calder, et al., 1974-message repetition and number of supporting arguments)*
	Your message is complex...	**...repeat your points three times.** *(message repetition and number of supporting arguments)*
	Your audience considers this message irrelevant...	**...concentrate on peripherals more than content.** *(Petty & Cacioppo, 1979; McGuire & Papageorgis, 1961-conditions of elaboration likelihood)*
	Your audience considers this topic to be relevant to them...	**...concentrate on the content of your communication more than anything peripheral to it.** *(conditions of elaboration likelihood)*
	Your points are well taken...	**...repeat them three times.** *(message repetition and number of supporting arguments)*
	Your reasons for what you are saying are weak...	**...do not repeat them.** *(Petty & Cacioppo, 1988-repetition of weak arguments)*
	Your message is complex...	**...emphasize its relevance.** *(message relevance)*
	You need to support your point...	**...use examples (case histories) in preference to statistics or data summaries.** *(Koballa, 1986; Bridges & Reinard, 1974-example vs. statistical summaries)*
	You want to nullify a potential argument against what you are saying...	**...introduce a weak form of the potential argument.** *(McGuire , 1961b; McGuire & Papageorgis, 1961-inoculation theory)*
	You want to nullify a potential argument against what you are saying...	**...state the potential argument and then prove it wrong.** *(inoculation theory)*

	You want to generate support for the beliefs you are espousing...	**...expose this audience to possible threatening opposition.** *(Jackson & Allen, 1987-two-sided messages)*
	Opposing arguments to what you are saying are likely to occur...	**...address the exact arguments that they are likely to hear.** *(McGuire & Papageorgis, 1961-refutation-same defense)*
	You want to increase your audience's acceptance of what you say...	**...support your points with 3 substantiating arguments from 3 separate, highly credible sources.** *(McCroskey, 1967, 1969, 1970; McCroskey, et al., 1972; Warren, 1969-multiple sources with multiple arguments & citation of evidence)*
	You want to change their long-term behavior or attitude...	**...concentrate on the substance of your communication. (If they are not ready for a complex message, employ peripherally-centered communication until they can process a more complex message.)** *(Petty, et al., 1986; Greenwald, 1978-Central route to long-term attitude change)*
	You want to change their attitude toward this topic...	**...relate this topic to this audience.** *(Andersen & Pryor, 1991-relevance)*
	You want them to change a behavior or attitude, even though they think what you want is irrelevant...	**...emphasize your credibility and the credibility of your supporting sources.** *(Ostermeier, 1969; Swanson, et al., 1984-education, occupation and experience)*
	You want to influence this audience concerning something they already think is relevant to them...	**...you can concentrate on the substance of your message.** *(Petty & Cacioppo, 1979, 1977-receiver involvement)*
	You want them to do something (take an action) that requires substantial involvement...	**...ask them to do something small that parallels the action you ultimately want them to take.** *(Freedman & Fraser, 1966; Dillard, Hunter & Burgoon, 1984-Foot-in-the-door effect)*
	You want this group to change an attitude or to take action, but they are irrational about your request...	**...make a ridiculous, extreme request so they will pull back and actually comply with the reasonable request you had in mind to begin with.** *(Dillard, et al;, 1984; Fern, et al., 1986-Door-in-the-face effect)*
	You want this audience to do something that has negative aspects to it...	**...mention only the positive ones, then after they agree, tell them the negative parts of the bargain.** *(Cialdini, 1978-Low ball effect)*
	You want to persuade...	**...be dynamic, animated.** *(Berko & Lemert, 1961; Mehrabian & Williams, 1969-vocal style and person perception)*
	You want to persuade...	**...tell your listeneres <u>exactly</u> what course of action you recommend.** *(Biddle, 1966; Cope & Richardson, 1972-nature of message conclusion: explicit vs. implicit)*

References

General ELM precepts:
Petty, R.E. and Cacioppo, J. *Attitudes and Persuasion : Classic and Contemporary Approaches.* (1981). Dubuque: Brown.

McGuire, W.J. and Papageorgis, D. The relative efficacy of various types of prior belief-defense in producing immunity against persuasion. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 1961, (62), 327-337.

McGuire, W.J. Inducing resistance to persuasion: Some contemporary approaches. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), *Advances in Experimental and Social Psychology* (1). New York: Academic Press, 1964.

Greenwald, A.G. and Albert, R.D. Acceptance and recall of improvised arguments. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. 1968, (8), 31-34.

Janis, I.L., and King, B.T. The influence of role-playing on opinion change. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 1954, (49), 211-218.

King, B.T. and Janis, I.L. Comparison of the effectiveness of improvised versus non-improvised role-playing in producing opinion change. *Human Relations*, 1956, (9), 177-186.

Watts, W.A. Relative persistence of opinion change induced by active compared to passive participation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 1967, (5), 4-15.

Elms, A.C. Influence of fantasy ability on attitude change through role-playing. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 1966, (4), 36-43.

Janis, I.L. and Gilmore, J. B. The influence of incentive conditions on the success of role-playing in modifying attitudes. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 1965, (1), 17-27.

O'Neill, P. and Levings, D.E. Induced bias scanning in a group setting to change attitudes toward bilingualism and capital punishment. *Journal of personality and Social Psychology*, 1979, (37), 1432-1438.

Greenwald, A.G. and Albert, R.d. Acceptance and recall of improvised arguments. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 1968, (8), 31-34.

Perloff, R.M. and Brock, T. C. And thinking makes it so: Cognitive responses to persuasion. In M. E. Roloff & G.R. Miller (Eds.),*Persuasion: New Directions in Theory and Research.* Beverly Hills, CA: Sage, 1980.

Tesser, A. Self-generated attitude change. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, 1978, (11), 289-338.

Tesser, A. and Conlee, M.C. Some effects of time and thought on attitude polarization.*Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 1975, (31), 262-270.

Tesser, A. and Leone, C. Cognitive schemas and thought as determinants of attitude change.*Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 1977, (13) 340-356.

Scheier, M.F. and Carver, C.S. Individual differences in self-concept and self-processes. In D. M. Wegner & R. R. Vallacher (Eds.), *The Self in Social Psychology*. New York: Oxford, 1980.

Petty, R.E., Harkins, S.G. and Williams, K.D. The effects of group diffusion of cognitive effort on attitudes: An information processing view. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 1980, (38), 81-92.

Cook, T.D. Competence, counterarguing, and attitude change. *Journal of Personality*, 1969, (37), 342-358.

Sternthal, B., Dholakia, R. and Leavitt, C. The persuasive effects of source credibility: a test of cognitive response analysis. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 1978, (4), 252-260.

Petty, R.E. and Cacioppo, J.T. Issue involvement can increase or decrease persuasion by enhancing message-relevant cognitive responses.*Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 1979, (37), 1915-1926. (b)

Harkins, S.G. and Petty, R.E. Effects of source magnification of cognitive effort on attitudes: An information processing view.*Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 1981, (40), 401-413.

Zillmann, D. Rhetoric elicitation of agreement in persuasion.*Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 1972, (210), 159-165.

O'Keefe, D. J. *Persuasion: Theory and Research*. (1990), Newbury Park: Sage.

Receiver involvement:
Petty, R.E., Cacioppo, J.T., and Goldman, R. Personal involvement as a determinant of argument-based persuasion. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 1981, (41), 847-855.

Petty, R.E. and Cacioppo, J.T. Issue involvement can increase or decrease persuasion by enhancing message-relevant cognitive responses. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 1979, (37), 1915-1926. (b).

Petty, R.E. and Cacioppo, J.T. Issue involvement as a moderator in the effects on attitude of advertising content and context. In K. B. Monroe (Ed.), *Advances in Consumer Research*, 1981, (8), Ann Arbor: Association for Consumer Research. (b).

Petty, R.E. and Cacioppo, J. T. The effects of involvement on responses to argument quantity and quality: Central and peripheral routes to persuasion.*Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 1984, (46), 69-81.

Petty, R.E., Cacioppo, J.T., and Schumann, D. Central and peripheral routes to advertising effectiveness: The moderating role of involvement. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 1983, (10), 135-146.

Distraction:
Petty, R.E. and Brock, T.C. Thought disruption and persuasion: Assessing the validity of attitude change experiments. In R.E. Petty, T.M. Ostrom, & T.C. Brock (Eds.), *Cognitive Responses in Persuasion*, (1981), Hillsdale: Lawrence Erlbaum. pp. 55-79.

Conclusions of the ELM:
Petty, R.E. and Cacioppo, J.T. (1986), *Communication and Persuasion: Central and Peripheral routes to Attitude Change*. New York: Springer-Verlag.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Credibility:
Cronkhite, G. and Liska, J.R. (1980). The judgement of communicant acceptability. In M.E. Roloff and G.R. Miller (Eds.), *Persuasion: New Directions in Theory and Research* (pp. 101-139). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Education, occupation, & experience of source:
Ostermeier, T.H. (1967). Effects of type and frequency of reference upon perceived source credibility and attitude change.*Speech Monographs*, (34), 137-144.

Swenson, R.A., Nash, D.L., and Roos, D.C. (1984). Source credibility and perceived expertness of testimony in a simulated child-custody case. *Professional Psychology*, (15), 891-898.

Non-fluencies:
McCroskey, J. C. and Mehrley, R.S. (1969). The effects of disorganization and non-fluency on attitude change and source credibility. *Speech Monographs*, (36), 13-21.

Miller, G.R. and Hewgill, M.A. (1964). The effect of variations in nonfluency on audience ratings of source credibility. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, (50), 36-44.

Speaking rate:
Miller, N., Maruyama, G., Beaber, R.J., and Valone, K. (1976). Speed of speech and persuasion. *Journal of Personality and Psychology*, (34), 615-624.

Addington, D.W. (1971). The effect of vocal variations on ratings of source credibility. *Speech Monographs*, (38), 242-247.

Gundersen, D.F. and Hopper, R. (1976). relationships between speech delivery and speech effectiveness. *Communication Monographs*, (43), 158-165.

Woodall, W.G. and Burgoon, J.K. (1983). Talking fast and changing attitudes: A critique and clarification. *Journal of Nonverbal behavior*, (8), 126-142.

Citation of evidence source:
McCroskey,J.C. (1967). The effects of evidence in persuasive communication. *Western Speech*, (31), 189-199.

McCroskey, J.C. (1969). A summary of experimental research on the effects of evidence in persuasive communication. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, (55), 169-176.

McCroskey, J.C. (1970). The effects of evidence as an inhibitor of counterpersuasion. *Speech Monographs*, (37), 188-194.

McCroskey, J.C., Young, T.J., and Scott, M.D. (1972). The effects of message-sidedness and evidence on inoculation against counterpersuasion in small group communication. *Speech Monographs*, (39), 205-212.

Ostermeier, T.H. (1967). Effects of type and frequency of reference upon perceived source credibility and attitude change. *Speech Monographs*, (34), 137-144.

Whitehead, J.L., Jr. (1971). effects of authority-based assertion on attitude and credibility. *Speech Monographs*, (38), 311-315.

Luchok, J.A. and McCroskey, J.C> (1978). The effect of quality of evidence on attitude change and source credibility. *Southern Speech Communication Journal*, (43), 371-383.

Warren, I.D. (1969). The effect of credibility in sources of testimony on audience attitudes toward speaker and message. *Speech Monographs*, (36), 456-458.

Position advocated:
Walster, E, Aronson, E., and Abrahams, D. (1966). On increasing the persuasiveness of a low prestige communicator. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, (2), 325-342.

Eagly, A.H., Wood, W., and Chaiken, S. (1978). Causal inferences about communicators and their effect on opinion change. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, (36), 424-435.

Liking of the communicator:
Applbaum, R.L. and Anatol, K.W.E. (1972). The factor structure of source credibility as a function of the speaking situation. *Speech Monographs*, (39), 216-222.

Pearce, W.B. and Brommel, B.J. (1972). Vocalic communication in persuasion. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, (58), 298-306.

Humor:
Chang, M.J. and Gruner, C.R. (1981). Audience reaction to self-disparaging humor. *Southern Speech Communication Journal*, (46), 419-426.

Gruner, C.R. (1967). Effect of humor on speaker ethos and audience information gain. *Journal of Communication*, (17), 228-233.

Gruner, C.R. (1970). The effect of humor in dull and interesting informative speeches. *Central States Speech Journal*, (21), 160-166.

Gruner, C.R. and Lampton, W.E. (1972). Effects of including humorous material in a persuasive sermon. *Southern Speech Communication Journal*, (38), 188-196.

Tamborini, R. and Zillman, D. (1981). College students' perceptions of lectures using humor. *Perceptual and Motor Skills*, (52), 427-432.

Bryant, J., Brown, D., Silberberg, A.R., and Elliott, S.M. (1981). Effects of humorous illustrations in college textbooks. *Human Communication Research*, (8), 43-57.

Munn, W.C. and Gruner, C.R. (1981). "Sick" jokes, speaker sex, and informative speech. *Southern Speech Communication Journal*, (46), 411-418.

Taylor, P.M. (1974). An experimental study of humor and ethos. *Southern Speech Communication Journal*, (39), 359-366.

Cred. effect-size: receiver involvement in issue:
Johnson, H.H. and Scileppi, J.A. (1969). Effects of ego-involvement conditions on attitude change to high and low credibility communicators. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, (13), 31-36.

Rhine, R.J. and Severance, L. J. (1970). Ego-involvement, discrepancy, source credibility, and attitude change. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, (16), 175-190.

Cred. effect size: timing of identification of communicator:
Greenberg, B.S., and Tannenbaum, P.H. (1961). The effects of low-credible sources on message acceptance. *Speech Monographs*, (33), 127-136.

Ward,C.D., and McGinnies, E. (1974). Persuasive effects of early and late mention of credible and noncredible sources. *Journal of Psychology*, (86), 17-23.

Cred. effect-size: pro-vs-counterattitudinal messages:
Bergin, A. E. (1962). The effect of dissonant persuasive communications upon changes in a self-referring attitude. *Journal of Personality*, (30), 423-438.

Bochner, S., and Insko, C.A. (1966). Communicator discrepancy, source credibility, and opinion change. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, (4), 614-621.

Harmon, R.R., and Coney, K.A. (1982). The persuasive effect of source credibility in buy and lease situations. *Journal of Marketing Research*, (19), 255-260.

McGinnies, E. (1973). Initial attitude, source credibility, and involvement factors in persuasion. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, (9), 285-296.

Cred. effect-size: liking:
Wachtler, J., and Counselman, E. (1981). When increased liking for a communicator decreases opinion change: An attribution analysis of attractiveness. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, (17), 386-395.

Chaiken, S. (1980). Heuristic versus systematic information processing and use of source versus message cues in persuasion. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, (39), 752-766.

Cooper, J., Darley, J.M., and Henderson, J.E. (1974). On the effectiveness of deviant- and conventional-appearing communicators: A field experiment. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, (29), 752-757.

Himmelfarb, S., and Arazi, D. (1974). Choice and source attractiveness in exposure to discrepant messages. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, (10), 516-527.

Cred. effect-size: attitude and experiencial similarity
Byrne, D. (1969). Attitudes and attraction. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology* (Vol. 4, pp. 35-89). New York: Academic Press.

Delia, [illegible] G. (1975). Regional dialect, message acceptance, and perceptance of the speaker. *Central States Speech Journal*, (26), 188-194.

Houck, C.L., and Bowers, J.W. (1969). Dialect and identification in persuasive messages. *Language and Speech*, (12), 180-186.

Schenck-Hamlin, W.J. (1978). The Effects of dialectic similarity, stereotyping, and message agreement on interpersonal perceptions. *Human Communication Research*, (5), 15-26.

Cred. effect-size: physical attractiveness:
Snyder, M. and Rothbart, M. (1971). Communicator Attractiveness and opinion change.*Canadian Journal of Behavioral Science*, (3), 377-387.

Widgery, R.N., and Ruch, R.S. (1981). Beauty and the Machiavellian. *Communication Quarterly*, (29), 297-301.

Chaiken, S. (1979). Communicator physical attractiveness and persuasion. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, (37), 1387-1397.

Patzer, G.L. (1983). Source credibility as a function of communicator physical

attractiveness. *Journal of Business Research*, (11), 229-241.

Order of arguments in message:
Gilkinson, H., Paulson, S.F., and Sikkink, D.E. (1954). Effects of order and authority in an argumentative speech. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, (40), 183-192.

Gulley, H.E., and Berlo, D.K. (1956). Effects of intercellular and intracellular speech structure on attitude change and learning. *Speech Monographs*, (43), 158-165.

Sikkink, D. (1956). An experimental study of the effects on the listener of anticlimax order and authority in an argumentative speech. *Southern Speech Journal*, (22), 73-78.

Sponberg, H. (1946). A study of the relative effectiveness of climax and anti-climax order in an argumentative speech. *Speech Monographs*, (13), 35-44.

Nature of message conclusion:
Biddle, P.R. (1966). *An experimental study of ethos and appeal for overt behavior in persuasion*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign.

Cope, F. and Richardson, D. (1972). The effects of reassuring recommendations in a fear-arousing speech. *Speech Monographs*, (39), 148-150.

Fine, B.J. (1957). Conclusion-drawing, communicator credibility, and anxiety as factors in opinion change. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, (54), 369-374.

Hovland,C.I., and Mandell, W. (1952). An experimental comparison of conclusion-drawing by the communicator and by the audience. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, (47), 581-588.

Leventhal, H., Watts, J.C., and Pagano, F. (1967). Effects of fear and instructions on how to cope with danger. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, (6), 313-321.

Tubbs, S.L. (1968). Explicit versus implicit conclusions and audience commitment. *Speech Monographs*, (35), 14-19.

Weiss, W., and Steinbock, S. (1965). The influence on communication effectiveness of explicitly urging action and policy consequences. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, (1), 396-406.

One-sided -vs- two-sided messages:
Jackson, S., and Allen, M. (1987, May). *Meta-analysis of the effectiveness of one-sided and two-sided argumentation*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the International Communication Association, Montreal.

Cialdini, R.B., and Schroeder, D.A. (1976). Increasing compliance by legitimizing paltry contributions: When even a penny helps.*Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, (340< 599-604.

Fear appeals:
Michel, E. (1991). *Revising Fear-Appeal Research from a Declared-Fear Perspective*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Southern States Communication Association, Tampa.

Example -vs- statistical summaries of supporting statements:
Koballa, T.R., Jr. (1986). Persuading teachers to reexamine the innovative elementary science programs of yesterday: The effect of anecdotal versus data-summary communications. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching*, (23), 437-449.

Bridges, D.A., and Reinard, J. C., Jr. (1974). The effects of refutational techniques on attitude change. *Journal of the American Forensic Association*, (10), 203-212.

Foot-in-the-Door Theory:
Freedman,J.L., and Fraser, S.C> (1966). Compliance without pressure: The foot-in-the-door technique. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, (4), 195-202.

Dillard, J.P., Hunter, J.E., and Burgoon, M. (1984). Sequential-request persuasive strategies: Meta-analysis of foot-in-the-door and door-in-the-face. *Human Communication Research*, (10), 461-488.

Door-in-the-Face Theory:
Cialdini, R.B., Vincent, J.E., Lewis, S.K., Catalan, J., Wheeler, D., and Darby, B.L. (1975). Reciprocal concessions procedure for inducing compliance: The door-in-the-face technique. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, (310), 206-215.

Fern, E.F., Monroe, K.B., and Avila, R.A. (1986). effectiveness of multiple request strategies: A synthesis of research results. *Journal of Marketing Research*, (23), 144-152.

Trait persuasability by gender:
Becker, B.J. (1986). Influence again: An examination of reviews and studies of gender differences in social influence. In J.S. Hyde and M.C. Linn (Eds.), *The Psychology of Gender: Advances through Meta-analysis* (pp. 178-209). Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Eagly, A.H., and Carli, L.L. (1981). Sex of researchers and sex-types communications as determinants of sex differences in influenceability: A meta-analysis of social influence studies. *Psychological Bulletin*, (90), 1-20.

Inoculation Theory:
McGuire, W.J. (1961b). Persistence of the resistance to persuasion induced by various types of prior defenses. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, (64), 241-248.

Inoculation & Cultural truisms:
McGuire, W.J., and Papageorgis, D. (1961). The relative efficacy of various types of prior belief-defense in producing immunity against persuasion. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, (62), 327-337.

Forewarning:
Petty,R.E., and Cacioppo, J.T. (1977). Forewarning, cognitive responding, and resistance to persuasion. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, (35), 645-655.

Petty, R.E., and Cacioppo, J.T. (1979a). Effects of forewarning of persuasive intent and involvement on cognitive responses and persuasion. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, (5), 1730176.

Primacy -vs- Recency:
Insko, C.A. (1967). *Theories of Attitude Change*. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.

Rosnow, R.L. (1966) Whatever happened to the "law of primacy"? *Journal of Communication*, (16), 10-31.

Rosnow, R.L., and Robinson, E.J. (1967). Primacy-recency. In R.L. Rosnow and E.J. Robinson (Eds.), *Experiments in persuasion* (pp. 99-104). New York: Academic Press.

Medium:

Andreoli,V., and Worchel, S. (1978). Effects of media, communicator, and message position on attitude change. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, (42), 59-70.

Chaiken, S., and Eagly, A.H. (1983). Communication modality as a determinant of persuasion: The role of communicator salience. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, (45), 241-256.

Worchel, S., Andreoli, V., and Eason, J. (1975). Is the medium the message? A study of the effects of media, communicator, and message characteristics on attitude change. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, (5), 151-172.

Decay of message effect:
Cook, T.D., and Flay, B.R. (1978). The persistence of experimentally induced attitude change. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology* (Vol. 11, pp. 1-57). New York: Academic Press.

Number of supporting statements & Decay:
Leventhal, H., and Niles, P. (1965). Persistence of influence for varying durations of exposure to threat stimuli. *Psychological Reports*, (16), 223-233.

Petty, R. E., and Cacioppo, J.T. (1986b). The elaboration likelihood model of persuasion. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology* (Vol. 19, pp. 123-205). New York: Academic Press.